#14
183

Our Docket No.: 042390.P9328 **PATENT**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Sathyanarayan, S. et al.) Examiner: Nguyen, M.

Application No.: 09/671,547) **Art Group: 2171**

Filed: September 27, 2000)

For: Method and Apparatus for Extracting Relevant and Content Based on User Preferences Indicated by User Actions)

Honorable Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPEAL BRIEF
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL
TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Sir:

Appellant hereby submits this Brief in triplicate in support of its appeal from a final decision by the Examiner, mailed November 24, 2003, in the above-referenced Application. Appellant respectfully requests consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for allowance of the above-captioned patent application.

An oral hearing is not desired.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The invention is assigned to Intel Corporation of 2200 Mission College Boulevard, Santa Clara, California 95052.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

To the best of Appellant's knowledge, there are no appeals or interferences related to the present appeal that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 26-72 are currently pending in the above-referenced application. All claims stand rejected.

Claims 26-28, 30-35, 37-38, 40-45, 47, 49, 51-52 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Haitsuka, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,201 ("Haitsuka") in the Final Office Action mailed November 24, 2003.

Claims 56-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kravets, U.S. Patent No. 6,363,377 ("Kravets").

Claims 29, 39, 46 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Haitsuka, in view of Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675 ("Ryan").

Claims 36, 48, 50, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Haitsuka, in view of Kravets.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on September 10, 1999, rejecting claims 26-72, Appellant has timely filed a Notice of Appeal herewith.

A copy of all claims on appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Despite the advantages offered by the availability of an enormous amount of online information, accessing the information still requires a relatively high degree of skill and luck on the part of the user. The user needs to know what web sites to go to locate certain types of information. Often a user will utilize a search engine (such as Lycos, or Alta Vista) or a web content listing service (such as Yahoo) to find information about a particular topic, but the quality of information retrieved by these types of services often depends on the service chosen and the quality of the search query. Once results are returned, the user often has to sift through the results web page by web page to find one or more that have the desired information. The search process may need to be repeated multiple times for a given search area depending on the particular aspect of a topic that the user desires information about. *See Background page 3, lines 9-18.*

A method and apparatus are described in the present application for extracting information relevant to the intent or purpose of a computer user based on that user's purpose or intent by automatically searching a number of sites on a network and filtering the results to maximize the relevance of the information presented to the user. *See Detailed Description page 5, lines 1-7.* In certain embodiments, at some point in a computer session, one or more queries related to the user's intent or purpose are generated and sent to one or more network sites. The results are returned to the user's computer for further filtering. *See Detailed Description page 5, lines 11-14.*

According to Claim 1, the invention can be described as a method. The method comprises the following steps:

monitoring computer usage of a computer user during a usage session *see, as an example, block 310 of Figure 3 performed by the activity monitor 222 of Figure 2, see also specification page 10, lines 9-14 and page 12, line 11 to page 14, line 23*;

recording information including hypertext links selected by the user during the monitored session *see, for example, page 10, line 9, page 12, line 12, page 14, line 2*;

analyzing the recorded hypertext links to determine ~~a~~ user interest for the session *see, for example, page 12, lines 12-13*; and

generating a search engine query based on the determined interest *see, for example, block 315 of Figure 3, performed by the query engine 224 of Figure 2, see also specification page 10, line 15 to page 11, line 2 and page 15, line 1 to page 16, line 7.*

According to Claim 56, the invention can be described as another method. The method comprises the following step:

transmitting a search query to a site over a network *see, as an example, block 320 of Figure 3 performed by the query engine224 and web browser 212 of Figure 2, see also specification page 10, line 15 to page 11, line2 and page 15, lines 15-17*;

receiving a search result document from the site, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries *see, as an example, block 325 of Figure 3 performed by the query engine224 and web browser 212, see also specification page 11, line 3 and page 15, line 16 to page 16, line 17*;

accessing pages associated with at least some of the search result entries *see, for example, page 11, lines 14-15 and page 17, lines 6-8*;

filtering the search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query *see, as an example, block 330 of Figure 3 and associated text*; and

selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison *see, for example, page 11, lines 11-13 and page 16, line 18 to page 17, line8.*

VI. ISSUES PRESENTED

I. Whether the Group I claims are anticipated by a reference which shows no search engine query and no determination of a user's interest;

II. Whether the Group II claims are anticipated by a reference which shows no set of words indicative of the user interest and no button for the user to click on;

III. Whether the Group III claims are anticipated by a reference which makes absolutely no mention of changes in a user's interest;

IV. Whether the Group IV claims are anticipated by a reference which shows no generation of search engine queries for application to multiple web sites;

V. Whether the Group V claims are rendered obvious by two references which make no mention of filtering based on the content of an accessed web page; and

VI. Whether the Group VI claims are anticipated by a reference which makes no mention of filtering based on the content of an accessed web page.

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For the purposes of this appeal:

Claims 26-29, 33, 34, 37-39, 41, 43-46, and 51-54 stand or fall together as Group I;

Claims 30, 31, and 40 stand or fall together as Group II;

Claims 32 and 47 stand or fall together as Group III;

Claims 35, 42, and 49 stand or fall together as Group IV;

Claims 36, 48, 50, and 55 stand or fall together as Group V; and

Claims 56-72 stand or fall together as Group VI.

VIII. ARGUMENT

A. The claims of Group I are not anticipated by Haitsuka as Haitsuka shows no search engine query and no determination of a user's interest.

The claims of Group I stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by Haitsuka, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,201 ("Haitsuka"). Haitsuka shows a method for monitoring Internet usage. The monitoring information is used to target advertising to the user (9:46 et seq.). Claim 26 of the present application recites, *inter alia*, "generating a search engine query based on the determined [user] interest." However, Haitsuka makes absolutely no mention of generating a search engine query based on a determined user interest.

In Columns 9 and 10 of Haitsuka, "monitoring information" is collected by recording user activity. There is no description of what happens to the monitoring information other than that it is sent to a monitoring server (9:66). Earlier in Haitsuka, it is stated that the monitoring server summarizes and classifies "feedback information" into multiple demographic profiles, and stores these profiles in a data store (6:61, 7:1). The monitoring server then selects targeted data and sends it to selected users (7:10-18). While the monitoring server functions are listed briefly in Haitsuka at Column 7, lines 10-18, none of the functions require a search engine query. If a search is involved, Haitsuka fails to suggest it.

Haitsuka does refer to searches (e.g. 9:52 et seq.), but only in the context of monitoring searches performed by a user. There is no suggestion that the monitoring information itself be used in searches. Certainly, there is no suggestion of "generating a search engine query." as recited in the Group I claims. Accordingly, the rejection based on Haitsuka is believed to be in error.

The Examiner asserts in the final action of November 24, 2003 that Haitsuka suggests generating a search engine query in its teaching of "applying the determined interest information analyzed by the monitoring system on targeting advertising to the user (See col. 9, lines 45-50), ... the system thus generating a query based on the determined interest so that the relevant and targeted data would be sent to the right users (See col. 7, lines 5-17)." (final action page 13, paragraph 9). This assertion is troubling in several respects.

First, as mentioned above, there is no suggestion in Haitsuka that the monitoring information be used in searches. Haitsuka teaches only that the monitoring server selects targeted data and sends it to selected users (7:10-18). This selection process is not explained beyond a short list of functions at Col. 7, lines 9-18.

Second, the Examiner suggests that the monitoring system analyzes the determined interest information. Haitsuka does not define a "monitoring system." Haitsuka has a client monitoring application 110 which collects information and sends it to a monitoring server 130. The client monitoring application does not analyze the information. It just sends the monitoring data to the server. The monitoring server performs the functions at Column 7, lines 10-18. Determining a user's interest is not part of this list, nor is analyzing such a determination.

Third, the Examiner cites sections of Haitsuka which do not support the assertion. Column 9, lines 45-50 states that "the monitoring information is used for targeting advertising to the user" but it makes no mention of generating a search engine query nor of determining user interest. Column 7, lines 5-17 describes functions performed by the monitoring server but none of these include generating a search engine query nor of determining a user interest, instead, scheduling and demographics are applied. This suggests a more conventional approach in which user characteristics, such as age, sex, income, employment, address etc. are used to select the most recent ads from a particular demographic matrix.

All of the claims of Group I include a limitation similar to that mentioned above of generating a search engine query based on the determined user interest. Accordingly all of these claims are believed to be allowable over the reference.

B. The claims of Group II are not anticipated by Haitsuka as Haitsuka shows no set of words indicative of the user interest and no button for the user to click on.

The claims of Group II also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by Haitsuka. Claim 30 in this group , which is dependent on Claim 26, discussed above, recites, for example "displaying a set of words indicative of the determined user interest and a button for the user to click on to indicate a desire to receive information regarding the displayed set of words."

The Examiner asserts that Haitsuka discloses displaying a set of words indicative of the determined user interest (See col. 7, lines 41-54) and a button for the user to click on to indicate a desire to receive information regarding the displayed set of words (See col. 7, lines 47-50).

Haitsuka makes no such showing. The section of Haitsuka to which the Examiner refers (col. 7, lines 41-54) describes how the user can access web pages using a browser application. This ties into the monitoring information not in that the monitoring server has generated the set of words but in that the monitoring application can record the set of words as monitoring information and send it to the monitoring server.

As to Claim 31,which is dependent on Claim 30, the Examiner asserts that Haitsuka discloses displaying an icon for the user to click on to start a usage session (See col. 5, lines 53-66). The section cited by the Examiner states simply that the client monitoring application and the monitoring server establish a session when an individual uses the local device. The Examiner has not pointed

out any icon in this section and Haitsuka mentions none. Accordingly the group II claims are believed to be allowable.

C. The claims of Group III are not anticipated by Haitsuka as Haitsuka makes absolutely no mention of changes in a user's interest.

The claims of Group III also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by Haitsuka. Claims 32 and 47 are directed to determining a change in the user interest by comparing recorded information to stored category profiles. The Examiner cites a section of Haitsuka (col. 6, lines 56-63) presumably for the statement in Haitsuka that "the monitoring server then summarizes and classifies the feedback information into multiple demographic profiles and stores these profiles in the data store." Haitsuka makes no clearer explanation of what is meant but this can perhaps be related to the monitoring server functions at column 7, lines 10-18.

It would seem that the monitoring server is using the feedback information to link demographic profiles to each user. The server will then send ads, also linked to the demographic profiles, to each available user based on the user links. However, this is not clearly described.

The claims, on the other hand, refer to "determining a change in the user interest." To link feedback information to a demographic, there is no need to determine a change, the server need only evaluate each piece of information and sort it. There is nothing in Haitsuka to suggest detecting a change in user interest. Accordingly, the group III claims are believed to be allowable over the reference.

D. The claims of Group IV are not anticipated by Haitsuka as Haitsuka shows no generation of search engine queries for application to multiple web sites.

The claims of Group IV also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by Haitsuka. These claims, refer, *inter alia*, to transmitting search engine queries to a plurality of web sites. The Examiner refers again to Haitsuka at column 9, lines 52-60. This section, as mentioned above, describes the general operation of a web browser by a user when visiting search engine sites such as Yahoo, Excite, Alta Vista, Lycos, Infoseek and Go. The specification in this section is providing some background about what the monitoring application is recording.

The Examiner would seem to be suggesting that a user, through a web browser, can access search engine forms on different search engine web sites, type in queries and then send the typed-in queries to the respective search engines. Such a reading of the Group IV claims takes these claims out of context.

The Group IV claims are dependent claims. Claim 35, for example, is dependent on Claim 26. In its entirety it recites:

"The method of claim 26, wherein generating a search engine query comprises constructing queries to perform searches using search engines on a plurality of web sites based on the user interest, the method further comprising transmitting the queries to the plurality of web sites."

Accordingly, a user interest must be determined, the queries must be constructed based on this determined user interest and the queries must be transmitted. In the cited section of Haitsuka, no user interest has been determined. In addition, the queries are not generated based on this user interest determination.

Contrary to what the Examiner suggests, Haitsuka teaches something very different. Haitsuka teaches that the user determines his interests and does all the searching. The Haitsuka

system will record what happens and send it to one single server, the monitoring server. The monitoring server does not perform a search but uses this information to select from a list of current ads. Accordingly, the Group IV claims are believed to be allowable over the reference.

E. The claims of Group V are not rendered obvious by two cited references as neither reference makes any mention of filtering based on the content of an accessed web page.

The claims of Group V stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as obvious over Haitsuka in view of Kravets, U.S. Patent No. 6,363,377 ("Kravets"). Kravets is cited as showing filtering. This is described primarily in Columns 8 and 9. The filtering appears to be performed by comparing the retrieved URL's to a hash list. The intersection between the two lists are either filtered out or filtered in depending on the application (see Figure 7). Kravets also describes clustering in Columns 6 and 7. Kravets draws a clear distinction between clustering and filtering. Clustering uses "lenses" (Figure 5) to group similar web pages together. Filtering excludes or includes particular content based on URL's.

Claim 36, for example, refers to filtering search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query. Kravets fails to suggest any kind of filtering based on information in accessed pages. This is particularly significant since the content lens, used in clustering, is not used in filtering and would presumably have this information available. The failure of Kravets to use this information in filtering suggests the nonobviousness of the present invention.

Kravets also fails to suggest comparing information to the query as recited in the Group V claims. Note that in claim 36 the query used for filtering is the same query that was sent to the search engines. The hash list used for filtering is a list of URL's. Even in clustering, there is no comparison of results to the query.

The Examiner suggests in the final Office action of November 24, 2003 that the clustering of Kravets can be used for filtering. "The search result entries of Kravets are partitioned into clusters. In order to group search result entries, the system accesses to pages of documents to classify similar documents into result clusters. Result clusters contain all the documents of interest so that user can indicate the relevancy of a cluster to his informational needs, thus comparing to his query for filtering the undesired documents." (action at pages 13-14, paragraph 9)

This application of the reference ignores the clear distinction in Kravets between clustering and filtering. Kravets does not teach that clustering can be used for filtering. Instead, Kravets teaches that the search engines will provide good results. The results are filtered only to eliminate objectionable material and material that is from an undesired source. Clustering is an aid to review the search results. This application of the reference also requires that several additional steps be performed by the user, including indicating the relevancy of clusters and comparing clusters to the query. These steps are not taught in the cited reference. The step of indicating the relevancy of a reference is not believed to be supported by the teachings of the reference.

Since neither cited reference taken alone or together shows comparing information from the accessed pages to the query as recited in the claims of Group V, these claims are believed to be allowable over the reference.

F. The claims of Group VI are not anticipated by Kravets as Kravets makes no mention of filtering based on the content of an accessed web page.

The claims of Group VI stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by Kravets. Claim 56, for example, also refers to filtering search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query. As explained above, Kravets fails to suggest any kind of filtering

based on information in accessed pages. Accordingly Claims 56, 63, 67, and 70 as well as the claims which depend therefrom are believed to be allowable over Kravets.

IX. CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully submits that all the appealed claims in this application are patentable and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

This brief is submitted in triplicate, along with a check for $330.00 to cover the appeal fee for one other than a small entity as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c). Please charge any shortages and credit any overpayment to out Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 1/6, 2004

Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA. 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980

X. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c)(9))

The claims on appeal read as follows:

26. A method comprising:

monitoring computer usage of a computer user during a usage session;

recording information including hypertext links selected by the user during the monitored session;

analyzing the recorded hypertext links to determine ~~a~~ user interest ~~intent~~ for the session; and

generating a search engine query based on the determined interest.

27. The method of claim 26, wherein analyzing comprises parsing hypertext links selected by the user into words and determining the user interest based on the parsed words.

28. The method of claim 26, wherein determining the user interest comprises determining the user interest based on the content of the hypertext links using heuristics.

29. The method of claim 26, wherein analyzing comprises applying the hypertext links to keyword tables, the keyword tables comprising words that are indicative of the user interest.

30. The method of claim 26, further comprising displaying a set of words indicative of the determined user interest and a button for the user to click on to indicate a desire to receive information regarding the displayed set of words.

31. The method of claim 26, further comprising displaying an icon for the user to click on to start the usage session.

32. The method of claim 26, further comprising determining a change in the user interest by comparing recorded information to stored category profiles.

33. The method of claim 26, wherein monitoring further comprises at least one of:

monitoring time spent at a network site;

monitoring network pages bookmarked by the user;

monitoring frequency that particular network pages are visited; and

monitoring the content of visited network pages, and

wherein analyzing comprises analyzing the recorded information and the hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session.

34. The method of claim 26, wherein generating the query is in response to a user action and is based on the content of an item or a document currently being displayed.

35. The method of claim 26, wherein generating a search engine query comprises constructing queries to perform searches using search engines on a plurality of web sites based on the user interest, the method further comprising transmitting the queries to the plurality of web sites.

36. The method of claim 35, further comprising receiving search result documents from the web sites, the search result documents comprising a plurality of search result entries, filtering the search result entries based on the determined interest, and selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the filtering.

37. A machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

monitoring computer usage of a computer user during a usage session;

recording information including hypertext links selected by the user during the monitored session;

analyzing the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session; and

generating a search engine query based on the determined interest.

38. The medium of claim 37, wherein the instructions for analyzing comprise instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform further operations comprising parsing hypertext links selected by the user into words and determining the user interest based on the parsed words.

39. The medium of claim 37, wherein the instructions for analyzing comprise instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform further operations comprising applying the hypertext links to keyword tables, the keyword tables comprising words that are indicative of the user interest.

40. The medium of claim 37, further comprising instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising displaying a set of words indicative of the determined user interest and a button for the user to click on to indicate a desire to receive information regarding the displayed set of words.

41. The medium of claim 37, wherein the instructions for generating the query are executed in response to a user action and based on the content of an item or a document currently being displayed.

42. The medium of claim 37, wherein the instructions for generating a search engine query comprise instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform further operations comprising constructing queries to perform searches using search engines on a plurality of web sites based on the user interest, and wherein the instructions further comprise instructions for transmitting the queries to the plurality of web sites.

43. A profile agent for a computer system comprising:

an activity monitor to monitor computer usage of a computer user during a usage session, to record information including hypertext links selected by the user during the monitored session, and to analyze the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session; and

a query engine to generate a search engine query based on the determined interest.

44. The agent of claim 43, wherein the activity monitor parses hypertext links selected by the user into words and determines the user interest based on the parsed words.

45. The agent of claim 43, wherein the activity monitor determines the user interest based on the content of the hypertext links using heuristics.

46. The agent of claim 43 wherein the activity monitor comprises keyword tables and analyzes the hypertext links by comparing the hypertext links to the keyword tables, the keyword tables comprising words that are indicative of the user interest.

47. The agent of claim 43, wherein the activity monitor comprises stored category profiles and determines a shift in the user interest by comparing recorded information to the stored category profiles.

48. The agent of claim 43, wherein the query engine transmits the search engine query to a search engine, the agent further comprising a results filter to receive a search result document from the queried search engine, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results filter to filter the search result entries based on the determined interest, and select a subset of the search result entries.

49. The agent of claim 43, wherein the query engine constructs queries to perform searches using search engines on a plurality of web sites based on the user interest, and transmits the queries to the plurality of web sites.

50. The agent of claim 49, further comprising a results filter to receive search result documents from the web sites, the search result documents comprising a plurality of search result entries, to filter the search result entries based on the determined interest, and to select a subset of the search result entries.

51. A computer system comprising:

a processor;

a network connection;

an activity monitor to monitor computer usage of a computer user during an Internet session, to record information including hypertext links selected by the user during the monitored session, and to analyze the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session; and

a query engine to generate search engine queries to perform searches using search engines on a plurality of Internet web sites based on the user interest, and to transmit the queries to the plurality of web sites.

52. The system of claim 51, wherein the activity monitor parses hypertext links selected by the user into words and determines the user interest based on the parsed words.

53. The system of claim 51, wherein the activity monitor comprises keyword tables and analyzes the hypertext links by comparing the hypertext links to the keyword tables to identify words that may be indicative of the user interest.

54. The system of claim 51, wherein the activity monitor records at least one of time spent at a network site, network pages bookmarked by the user, frequency that particular network pages are visited, and the content of visited network pages, and the activity monitor analyzes the recorded information and the hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session.

55. The system of claim 51, further comprising a results filter to receive a search result document from queried search engines, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results filter to filter the search result entries based on the determined interest, and select a subset of the search result entries.

56. A method comprising:

transmitting a search query to a site over a network;

receiving a search result document from the site, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries;

accessing pages associated with at least some of the search result entries;

filtering the search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query; and

selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison.

57. The method of claim 56, wherein at least some of the information from the accessed pages comprises hypertext links to further pages associated with the respective search result entry, the method further comprising parsing hypertext links into constituent elements, and comparing the hypertext link constituent elements to elements of the search query.

58. The method of Claim 57, wherein selecting a subset of the search result entries comprises selecting using the comparison of information from accessed pages and the comparison of hypertext link constituent elements.

59. The method of claim 58, wherein at least some of the search result entries include a description of an associated document, the method further comprising parsing at least a portion of the descriptions into constituent elements, and comparing the description constituent elements to elements of the search query and wherein selecting a subset comprises selecting a subset using the description constituent elements comparison.

60. The method of claim 59, further comprising generating a summary document comprised of the selected subset of the search result entries, and displaying the summary document.

61. The method of claim 56, wherein the network comprises the Internet, and the site comprises a search engine at a remote World Wide Web site.

62. The method of claim 56, wherein the network comprises the Internet, the method further comprising transmitting the search query to a plurality of search engines at remote World Wide Web sites and receiving a plurality of search result documents from the search engines, each search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries.

63. A machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

transmitting a search query to a site over a network;

receiving a search result document from the site, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries;

accessing pages associated with at least some of the search result entries;

filtering the search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query; and

selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison.

64. The medium of claim 63, wherein at least some of the information from the accessed pages comprises hypertext links to further pages associated with the respective search results entry, the medium further comprising instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform further operations comprising parsing hypertext links into constituent elements, and comparing the hypertext link constituent elements to elements of the search query.

65. The medium of Claim 64, wherein the instructions for selecting a subset of the search result entries comprise instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform further operations comprising selecting using the comparison of information from accessed pages and the comparison of hypertext link constituent elements.

66. The medium of claim 63, wherein at least some of the search result entries include a description of an associated document, the medium further comprising instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform further operations comprising parsing at least a portion of the descriptions into constituent elements, and comparing the description constituent elements to elements of the search query and wherein the instructions for selecting a subset comprise instructions which, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to perform

further operations comprising selecting a subset using the description constituent elements comparison.

67. An apparatus comprising:

a query engine to transmit a search query to a site over a network; and

a results filter to receive a search result document from the site, the search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results filter further to access pages associated with at least some of the search result entries, to filter the search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query, and to select a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison.

68. The system of claim 67, wherein at least some of the information from the accessed pages comprises hypertext links to further pages associated with the respective search result entry, and wherein the results filter parses hypertext links into constituent elements and compares the hypertext link constituent elements to elements of the search query.

69. The system of claim 67, wherein at least some of the search result entries include a description of an associated document, the results filter further to parse at least a portion of the descriptions into constituent elements, and compare the description constituent elements to elements of the search query.

70. A computer system comprising:

a processor;

a network connection;

a query engine to transmit using the network connection search queries to search engines at Internet sites; and

a results filter to receive search result documents over the network connection from the search engines, the search result documents comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results

filter further to access pages associated with at least some of the search result entries, to filter the search result entries by comparing information from the accessed pages to the query, and to select a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison.

71. The system of claim 70, wherein at least some of the information from the accessed pages comprises hypertext links to further pages associated with the respective search result entry, and wherein the results filter parses hypertext links into constituent elements and compares the hypertext link constituent elements to elements of the search query.

72. The system of claim 70, wherein at least some of the search result entries include a description of an associated document, the results filter further to parse at least a portion of the descriptions into constituent elements, and compare the description constituent elements to elements of the search query.